

**REMARKS****INTRODUCTION:**

Independent claims 14 and 17 have been amended. Reconsideration with regard to previously-rejected claims 14-24 is respectfully requested. Claims 27-32 are allowed.

**THE REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 14 AND 17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102 FOR ANTICIPATION:**

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 2, claims 14-24 (claims 14 and 17 being the independent claims) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Chang et al (US Patent 7,280,530 B2) (hereinafter "Chang"). The Advisory Action further elaborated on this rejection in light of arguments by the applicant. The current amendment traverses this rejection, and reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested.

Specific to the rejection, the present invention involves a two-step system whereby a calling device (200') connects with an intermediary receiving device (200"). The first step involves using a server (300') to help locate and establish a connection between the two devices. This step is recited in independent claims 14 and 17 as "a single channel gateway means in said device for establishing a path between said first port and said second port inside said device in response to a request from a server on the packet based telecommunication network that is separate from a calling device that a caller at a remote location is using, and the server is acting on behalf of the caller at the remote location." The second step involves the calling device making a direct connection with the receiving device and not requiring to pass communication through the server in the process. This is recited in independent claims 14 and 17 as "means for responding to said request by connecting said second port directly to said caller at the remote location via the packet based telecommunication network without passing through said server." Therefore, in the present invention, it is essential and beneficial that the gateway location server is separate from the calling device, so the server can be used by all callers and not only the ones connected to the calling device.

Chang fails to teach such a system. As the examiner contends, Chang "discloses a gateway server 26 that is separate from a calling telephone 38 and that the second port 162 is connected 'directly' to the calling device 38." The examiner analogizes this to the present invention by likening gateway location server (300") as gateway server 26 and gateway telephone (200") as gateway server 126. However, this is an incorrect analogy. In Chang,

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment with Request for Continued Examination, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 23, 2010

By:

  
David M. Pitcher

Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501